UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/998,895	11/30/2001	Joan C. Teng	21756-013000	4164

51206 7590 06/18/2008

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
8TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER	
RUTLEDGE, AMELIA L	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/998,895	TENG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	AMELIA RUTLEDGE	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 April 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5,6,9-11,13-16,20,21,23-26,30,31,33-36,39 and 41-53* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5,6,9-11,13-16,20,21,23-26,30,31,33-36,39 and 41-52* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *53* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *4/9/08*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to: Amendment, filed 04/09/2008; RCE, filed 04/09/2008; IDS, filed 04/09/2008.

2. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9-11, 13-16, 20, 21, 23-26, 30, 31, 33-36, 39, and 41-53 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 14, 24 and 39 are independent claims.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 04/09/2008 has been entered.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant's arguments in regard to the IDS are persuasive, therefore the references listed in the IDS filed 04/09/2008 have been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 14-16, 20, 21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Regarding independent claim 14, the preamble of claim 14 recites "*One or more processor readable storage devices having processor readable code embodied on said processor readable storage devices, said processor readable code for programming one or more processors to perform a method comprising the steps of:...*" Claim 14 is directed to an article of manufacture, which in order to be statutory must fall under the category of articles produced from raw or prepared materials and which are structurally and functionally interconnected to the program in such a manner as to enable the program to act as a computer component and **realize its functionality**.

As claimed, independent claim 14 is non-statutory for being directed to non-functional descriptive material, because while it recites a "processor readable storage device", the invention claimed in claim 14, as claimed, would not be capable of causing a functional change in the computer. In other words, although the recited code of claim 14 is stored on the device, the preamble of claim 14 does not require that the claimed method be executed or performed.

Regarding dependent claims 15, 16, 20, 21, and 23, claims 15, 16, 20, 21, and 23 are rejected because they depend from independent claim 14 and add no limitations which would render the claimed invention statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9-11, 13-16, 20, 21, 23-26, 30, 31, 33-36, 39, and 41-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng, U.S. Patent No. 6,067,548, issued May 2000, in view of McNally, et al. ("McNally"), U.S. Patent No. 6,823,513 B1, issued November 2004.

Independent claim 1 cites: *A computer-implemented method for using workflows, comprising the steps of: associating workflows with one or more groups in an identity system, each group including one or more users of the identity system;*

receiving a request to perform a task that pertains to at least one identity profile of an entity in said identity system; and performing a first workflow for said task, said first workflow is associated with a first group that includes a target identity profile;

Cheng teaches a method for using workflows in an identity system, using virtual links to associate a workflow with a group that includes a target identity profile (col. 3, l. 15-col. 5, l. 16). Cheng teaches that the system has organizational objects which are sub-groups of the enterprise, such as employees and departments (col. 6, l. 40-col. 7, l. 67). Cheng teaches that the organizational model of the system can be applied in workflow systems, by using the roles to assign tasks in a workflow system (col. 13, l. 9-col. 16, l. 10; col. 16, l. 10-65).

Claim 1 also cites: *said request includes an identification of said target identity profile; said step of performing includes the steps of identifying a plurality of workflows that perform said task and are associated with groups that include said target identity profile, said set plurality workflows includes said first workflow, reporting said set plurality workflows to a user via a Graphical User Interface (GUI), receiving from the user a selection of said first workflow from the plurality of workflows, and performing one or more steps of said first workflow*;

Cheng teaches that the user may use a graphical user interface to manipulate the organizational objects and tasks (col. 11, l. 52-58; col. 12, l. 64-col. 13, l. 33; Fig. 9, 10), which suggests use of a GUI to assign workflows. Cheng teaches that the organizational model of the system can be applied in workflow systems, by using the roles to assign tasks in a workflow system (col. 13, l. 9-col. 16, l. 10; col. 16, l. 10-65). However, Cheng does not explicitly teach that the GUI reports a set plurality of workflows to perform a task to the user and receives a selection of the workflow from the user. McNally is relied upon to teach a workflow distribution process with a GUI from which a user can select from a plurality of assigned workflows and perform steps of the workflow (col. 5, l. 61-col. 6, l. 59; Figs. 5-8).

Claim 1 also cites: *wherein; said first workflow comprises a predefined set of steps that perform said tasks to modify one or more attributes of the target identity profile, said predefined set of steps comprising a first step and a second step;*

said first step is performed by a first program;

said second step is performed by a second program;

information is passed between said first program and said second program according to a defined set of rules:

Cheng teaches a workflow that has a predefined set of steps for performing a task, and that the workflow will modify one or more attributes of the target identity profile, because Cheng teaches the assignment of dynamic roles by using virtual links in the workflow system, so that the system can determine at run time to whom the task should be assigned (col. 15, l. 37-col. 16, l. 21; especially col. 16, l. 7-21). Cheng teaches modifying attributes of the target identity profile by assigning different role attributes, for example (col. 13, l. 24-col. 14, l. 65). Cheng teaches that each workflow comprises a predefined set of steps by more than one program, to perform tasks to affect the identity profile or group, and passing information between first and second programs according to a defined set of rules (col. 16, l. 22-65).

Claim 1 recites: *at least one of the first program and the second program is external to the workflow.*

While Cheng does not explicitly teach that at least one of the first program and the second program is external to the workflow, McNally teaches that at least one of the first program and the second program is external to the workflow, because McNally teaches that access to program resources outside the workflow can be requested or assigned to an operator (col. 5, l. 44-col. 7, l. 52; especially col. 7, l. 3-35).

Both Cheng and McNally are directed to the assignment of workflows and rules to users. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the intuitive interface disclosed by McNally to the workflow and

organization modeling system disclosed by Cheng, since McNally and Cheng recognized the need to limit access to proprietary workflow processes (McNally col. 2, l. 33-51) while facilitating collaboration between organizations (Cheng, col. 3, l. 1-12).

Regarding dependent claim 2, Cheng teaches *associating said first workflow with said first group, said step of associating said first workflow includes choosing a first entry in a data structure, said data structure is a hierarchical data structure of entities in the identity system, said first domain includes said first entry and entries below said first entry*, because Cheng teaches that the system has organizational objects which are sub-groups of the enterprise, such as employees and departments, arranged in a hierarchical data structure (col. 6, l. 40-col. 7, l. 67, Fig. 3, 4).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Cheng teaches *identifying one or more workflows associated with a target identity profile*, because Cheng teaches that the organizational model of the system can be applied in workflow systems, by using the roles to assign tasks in a workflow system (col. 13, l. 9-col. 16, l. 10; col. 16, l. 10-65).

Regarding dependent claims 5 and 6, Cheng teaches that the user can request to delete or modify a target identity profile, because Cheng teaches that the identifier and objects of the member class have a life cycle where a member, i.e., identity profile can be archived, modified, or deleted (col. 8, l. 1-51; col. 12, l. 27-64).

Regarding dependent claim 9, Cheng teaches that *said steps of associating, receiving and performing are performed by an integrated identity and access system*, because Cheng teaches a system of interconnected databases with multiple servers for identity and access (Fig. 8, col. 11, l. 4-col. 12, l. 26).

Regarding dependent claim 10, Cheng teaches that a request may be for self-registration, because Cheng teaches a user interface for self registration (col. 12, l. 18-64).

Regarding dependent claim 11, Cheng teaches that workflows can delegate work, i.e., tasks, to other workflow processes or resources (col. 13, l. 9-col. 15, l. 19).

Regarding dependent claim 13, Cheng teaches *wherein said hierarchical data structure includes an LDAP directory* (col. 15, l. 14-19, Fig. 8).

In regard to independent claim 14, claim 14 reflects the processor readable storage device(s) having processor readable code used to perform the method as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 15-21 and 23, claims 15-21 and 23 reflect the processor readable storage device(s) having processor readable code used to perform the method as claimed in claims 2, 3, 4, 7-9, 11, and 13, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 24, claim 24 reflects the apparatus used to perform the method as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 25-33, claims 25-31 and 33 reflect the apparatus used to perform the method as claimed in claims 2, 3, 4, 7-9, 11, and 13, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 34, Cheng teaches *managing a target identity profile*, because Cheng teaches that the identifier and objects of the member class have

a life cycle where a member, i.e., identity profile can be archived, modified, or deleted (col. 8, l. 1-51; col. 12, l. 27-64).

Regarding dependent claim 35, Cheng teaches *wherein managing said identity profile comprises one or more tasks selected from the group consisting of: creating a user, deleting a user, changing a user attribute, creating a group, deleting a group, and changing a group attribute*, because Cheng teaches that the identifier and objects of the member class have a life cycle where a member, i.e., identity profile can be archived, modified, or deleted (col. 8, l. 1-51; col. 12, l. 27-64).

Regarding dependent claim 36, Cheng teaches managing certificates associated with identity profiles (col. 15, l. 4-19).

Regarding independent claim 39, Cheng teaches *associating workflows with one or more groups in an identity system, each group including one or more users of the identity system and each user of the identity system having an associated identity profile*; *receiving a request to perform a task that pertains to a target identity profile in the identity system, wherein the request includes an identification of the target identity profile*; because Cheng teaches a method for using workflows in an identity system, using virtual links to associate a workflow with a group that includes a target identity profile (col. 3, l. 15-col. 5, l. 16). Cheng teaches that the system has organizational objects which are sub-groups of the enterprise, such as employees and departments (col. 6, l. 40-col. 7, l. 67). Cheng teaches that the organizational model of the system can be applied in workflow systems, by using the roles to assign tasks in a workflow system (col. 13, l. 9-col. 16, l. 10; col. 16, l. 10-65).

Claim 39 cites: *identifying a plurality of workflows that perform the task and are associated with groups that include the user associated with the target identity profile; reporting the plurality of workflows via a Graphical User Interface (GUI) in response to the request; receiving a user selection of a first workflow from the plurality of workflows via the GUI*; Cheng teaches that the user may user a graphical user interface to manipulate the organizational objects and tasks (col. 11, l. 52-58; col. 12, l. 64-col. 13, l. 33; Fig. 9, 10), which suggests use of a GUI to assign workflows. Cheng teaches that the organizational model of the system can be applied in workflow systems, by using the group roles to assign tasks in a workflow system (col. 13, l. 9-col. 16, l. 10; col. 16, l. 10-65). However, Cheng does not explicitly teach that the GUI reports a set plurality of workflows to perform a task to the user and receives a selection of the workflow from the user. McNally is relied upon to teach a workflow distribution process with a GUI from which a user can select from a plurality of assigned workflows and perform steps of the workflow (col. 5, l. 61-col. 6, l. 59; Figs. 5-8).

Claim 39 further cites: *performing a first step of said first workflow with a first program to modify one or more attributes of the target identity profile, wherein the first program comprises one of a user manager, a group manager, and an organization manager; and*

performing a second step of said first workflow with a second program, wherein the second program comprises one of the user manager, the group manager, and the organization manager and wherein the second program is different from the first program.

Cheng teaches a workflow that has a predefined set of steps for performing a task, and that the workflow will modify one or more attributes of the target identity profile, because Cheng teaches the assignment of dynamic roles by using virtual links in the workflow system, so that the system can determine at run time to whom the task should be assigned (col. 15, l. 37-col. 16, l. 21; especially col. 16, l. 7-21). Cheng teaches modifying attributes of the target identity profile by assigning different role attributes, for example (col. 13, l. 24-col. 14, l. 65).

Cheng teaches that each workflow comprises a predefined set of steps by more than one program, to perform tasks to affect the identity profile or group, and passing information between first and second programs according to a defined set of rules (col. 16, l. 22-65; col. 17, l. 5-51). Cheng teaches that the system executes an expression at runtime to determine to who a task should be assigned, as well as querying the organizational management system, i.e., a first program of a user manager (col. 15, l. 49-col. 16, l. 21). Cheng also teaches that a workflow is defined by a procedure having a plurality of nodes with relationships defined between, where each of the nodes is defined to be performed either by the computer system or by an agent, i.e., a second program different from the first program, a part of the organizational management system (col. 16, l. 10-65).

Both Cheng and McNally are directed to the assignment of workflows and rules to users. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the intuitive interface disclosed by McNally to the workflow and organization modeling system disclosed by Cheng, since McNally and Cheng

recognized the need to limit access to proprietary workflow processes (McNally col. 2, l. 33-51) while facilitating collaboration between organizations (Cheng, col. 3, l. 1-12).

Regarding dependent claim 41, Cheng teaches a workflow that has a predefined set of steps for performing a task, and that the workflow will modify one or more attributes of the target identity profile, because Cheng teaches the assignment of dynamic roles by using virtual links in the workflow system, so that the system can determine at run time to whom the task should be assigned (col. 15, l. 37-col. 16, l. 21; especially col. 16, l. 7-21).

Cheng teaches deleting the target identity profile by the workflow, because Cheng teaches removal of a member object, i.e., target identity profile, corresponding to a situation where the identity profile is archived or deleted (col. 8, l. 17-37). While Cheng discloses an improvement over the prior art at col. 8, l. 38-50 in that old identity profile information may be archived rather than immediately deleted, Cheng also explicitly discloses deleting member objects as well as virtual links (col. 12, l. 26-53). Therefore, while Cheng discloses an improvement over prior systems, Cheng also discloses that the member object, or target identity profile, may be deleted.

Regarding dependent claims 42-43, Cheng teaches that the identifier and objects of the member class have a life cycle where a member, i.e., identity profile can be archived, modified, or deleted by the authorized user associated with the member (col. 8, l. 1-51; col. 12, l. 27-64).

Regarding dependent claim 44, Cheng teaches that *said second program performs a second workflow to modify one or more attributes of the target identity*

profile, because Cheng teaches that each workflow comprises a predefined set of steps by more than one program, to perform tasks to affect the identity profile or group, and passing information between first and second programs according to a defined set of rules (col. 16, l. 22-65; col. 17, l. 5-51). Cheng teaches the assignment of dynamic roles by using virtual links in the workflow system, so that the system can determine at run time to whom the task should be assigned (col. 15, l. 37-col. 16, l. 21; especially col. 16, l. 7-21). Cheng teaches modifying attributes of the target identity profile by assigning different role attributes, for example (col. 13, l. 24-col. 14, l. 65).

Regarding dependent claim 45, Cheng teaches that *the second program is identified in an event catalog of the first workflow*, since Cheng teaches a flexible and dynamic role resolution in the workflow system because there are a plurality of nodes with relationships defined between by rules or regular expressions (col. 16, l. 10-65).

Regarding dependent claim 46, Cheng teaches *that the event catalog further identifies one or more parameters for passing information between the first program and the second program*, because Cheng teaches that the system queries which resource or who should be allowed or assigned to do the task (col. 16, l. 60-65).

Regarding dependent claim 47, claim 47 recites *the method of claim 1, wherein identifying the plurality of workflows that perform the task and are associated with the groups that include the target identity profile further comprises identifying workflows of the plurality of workflows for which a user issuing the request to perform the task is authorized.* Cheng teaches user authorization checking at col. 14, l. 6-65.

Regarding dependent claim 48, claim 48 recites *the method of claim 47, wherein the groups that include the target identity profile include one or more groups to which the target identity profile is a static member.* Cheng teaches both static and dynamic task and organization assignment for identity profiles, having either dynamic or hard coded relationships, using virtual links (col. 9, l. 15-col. 10, l. 61; especially l. 9-21).

Regarding dependent claim 49, claim 49 recites *the method of claim 48, wherein the target identity profile is identified as a static member of the one or more groups based on a group identity profile for each of the one or more groups.* Cheng teaches both static and dynamic task and organization assignment for identity profiles, having either dynamic or hard coded relationships, using virtual links (col. 9, l. 15-col. 10, l. 61; especially l. 9-21).

Regarding dependent claim 50, claim 50 recites *the method of claim 49, wherein the groups that include the target identity profile include one or more groups to which the target identity profile is a dynamic member.* Cheng teaches both static and dynamic task and organization assignment for identity profiles, having either dynamic or hard coded relationships, using virtual links (col. 9, l. 15-col. 10, l. 61; especially l. 9-21).

Regarding dependent claim 51, claim 51 recites *the method of claim 50, wherein the target identity profile is identified as a dynamic member of the one or more groups based on application of a rule defined by the group identity profile for each of the one or more groups.* Cheng teaches both static and dynamic task and organization assignment for identity profiles, having either dynamic or hard coded relationships, using virtual links (col. 9, l. 15-col. 10, l. 61; especially l. 9-21). Cheng teaches rule

application defined by expressions, for the group identity profiles, for example the system will query the organizational system to determine if an individual is a manager (col. 13, l. 44-col. 14, l. 65).

Regarding dependent claim 52, claim 52 recites *the method of claim 51, wherein the groups that include the target identity profile include one or more groups to which the target identity profile is a nested member*. Cheng teaches groups which contain nested members, which include target identity profiles, for example, Figure 4, element 70 depicts the group "employees" which contain the nested members, elements 78, 80, and 82: "engineers", "marketers" and "temp", which are all nested members of the "employees" group.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 53 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim (independent claim 1, and dependent claims 47-52), but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments filed 04/09/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue the combination of Cheng and McNally, and argue that Cheng does not teach the limitation of independent claim 1, *said step of performing includes*

the steps of identifying a plurality of workflows that perform said task and are associated with groups that include said target identity profile, said set plurality workflows includes said first workflow, reporting said set plurality workflows to a user via a Graphical User Interface (GUI), receiving from the user a selection of said first workflow from the plurality of workflows, and performing one or more steps of said first workflow (See Remarks, p. 13-14). However, the combination of Cheng and McNally was relied upon to teach the limitation. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Applicant sets forth individual arguments against the McNally reference at p. 14, par. 3-p. 15, par. 1 of the Remarks. It is the examiner's opinion that the above limitation is obvious in view of the combination of Cheng and McNally, which together disclose each and every limitation of claim 1, as well as the remaining rejected independent and dependent claims.

While applicants argue that "Cheng clearly describes the workflows as distinct from the methods of the organizational objects" (see Remarks, p. 14, par. 1), applicants have mischaracterized the Cheng patent, since as stated in the rejection of claim 1, Cheng teaches a workflow that has a predefined set of steps for performing a task, and that the workflow will modify one or more attributes of the target identity profile, because Cheng teaches the assignment of dynamic roles by using virtual links in the workflow system, so that the system can determine at run time to whom the task should be

assigned (col. 15, l. 37-col. 16, l. 21; especially col. 16, l. 7-21). Cheng teaches modifying attributes of the target identity profile by assigning different role attributes, for example (col. 13, l. 24-col. 14, l. 65).

Applicants argue that because Cheng discloses APIs, Cheng does not teach API calls being made from a workflow (see Remarks, p. 14, par. 2). However, applicants' arguments do not address the fact that Cheng discloses both an API and virtual links which are for modifying one or more attributes of the target identity profile dynamically by the workflow. Cheng teaches both static and dynamic task and organization assignment for identity profiles, having either dynamic or hard coded relationships, using virtual links (col. 9, l. 15-col. 10, l. 61; especially l. 9-21).

For these reasons, it is believed that the rejections of claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9-11, 13-16, 20, 21, 23-26, 30, 31, 33-36, 39, and 41-52 should be maintained.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AMELIA RUTLEDGE whose telephone number is (571)272-7508. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:30 - 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Amelia Rutledge/
Examiner, Art Unit 2176